

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding the Implementation of the Suspension of Direct Access Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1x and Decision 01-09-060

Rulemaking 02-01-011

JOINT RESPONSE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICATION FOR REHEARING OF DECISION 06-07-030

MARK R. HUFFMAN ANN KIM

Pacific Gas and Electric Company 77 Beale Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 973-3842

Fax: (415) 973-0516 E-mail: mrh2@pge.com

Attorneys for PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

On behalf of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY and PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

September 5, 2006

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding the Implementation of the Suspension of Direct Access Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1x and Decision 01-09-060

Rulemaking 02-01-011

JOINT RESPONSE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICATION FOR REHEARING OF DECISION 06-07-030

Pursuant to Rule 86.2 of the California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission)
Rules of Practice and Procedure, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern
California Edison Company (SCE) file this joint response in opposition to the *Application For Rehearing Of Decision 06-07-030* (*Rehearing App'n*) filed jointly by the Northern California
Power Agency, California Municipal Utilities Association, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto
Irrigation District, Turlock Irrigation District, and the City of Hercules (jointly "Municipal
Parties"). The Commission should reject the Municipal Parties' *Rehearing App'n*. Contrary to
the Municipal Parties' assertions, there is no legal error in Decision 06-07-030.

First, contrary to the Municipal Parties' assertion, Decision 06-07-030 does not adopt an arbitrary and capricious distinction between classes of departing load and direct access customers. Decision 06-07-030 draws a reasoned distinction between those non-bundled

In this response, PG&E and SCE refer to the Commission's existing Rules of Practice and Procedures. PG&E and SCE understand that the revised Rules, adopted in Decision 06-07-006, will not be in effect until the Office of Administrative Law has formally noticed and approved the changes, which is not expected to occur until September 2006 or later.

customers who are responsible for the costs of power procured by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), and those who are not.

Second, contrary to the Municipal Parties' assertion, Decision 06-07-030 does not provide an unlawful windfall to bundled service customers. Decision 06-07-030 provides a reasoned, lawful allocation of cost responsibility among various customer groups.

Finally, and again contrary to the Municipal Parties' assertion, the issuance of Decision 06-07-030 does not violate Municipal Parties' due process rights. The Commission's Rules clearly permit the Commission to adopt a final decision that contains substantive changes from the Draft Decision, as long as those changes are in response to comments on the Draft Decision. Also, the Municipal Parties had clear notice of the possible outcomes being considered by the Commission. The issues have been fully framed and debated by the parties in the *Working Group Report* incorporated into the record on February 23, 2006, in comments and reply comments on the *Report*, and in comments and reply comments on the June 20, 2006, Draft Decision.

I. DECISION 06-07-030'S DETERMINATION TO APPLY A TOTAL PORTFOLIO ADJUSTMENT TO THE RATES PAID BY NON-BUNDLED CUSTOMERS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COSTS OF DWR POWER IS LAWFUL

In Decision 05-12-045 the Commission made it clear that the only proper way to calculate ongoing CTC, a charge established pursuant to AB 1890 and applicable to nearly all customers, bundled, direct access and departing load, is the statutory method. (D.05-12-045 at Conclusion of Law 2 and Ordering Paragraph 6.) The Commission determined that in calculating the ongoing CTC there was to be no "total portfolio" or "indifference" offset in the

ongoing CTC calculation. (D.05-12-045, at pp. 16-18.) These Commission determinations are not at issue in this *Rehearing App'n*. 2

In Decision 05-12-045 the Commission made it clear that it was not addressing whether a total portfolio adjustment should be applied to other costs included in the Cost Responsibility Surcharge (CRS), stating that that issue was to be addressed in this proceeding.

Decision 06-07-030 addresses this topic. Decision 06-07-030 discusses whether an indifference calculation should be used to help establish the CRS obligations of non-bundled customers who are exempt from the DWR power costs. It determines that no indifference calculation should be applied to the CRS obligations of non-bundled customers that are exempt from the DWR power costs. (*Id.*, pp. 33-34.) For these customers, any indifference calculation would address only utility costs. It would not include any DWR costs, as these customers are exempt from any responsibility for those costs.

Since only utility costs would be included in the indifference calculation for these DWR power charge-exempt customers, application of an indifference calculation to their rates would result, in effect, in exactly the total portfolio CTC calculation rejected by the Commission in Decision 05-12-045. As Decision 06-07-30 correctly concludes, "[s]uch an outcome is contrary to the requirement for uniform CTC treatment to apply across customer categories." (*Id.* p. 35.)

PG&E and SCE agree with Decision 06-07-030 that the logic of Decision 05-12-045 leads to the result being challenged here. In any event, the result adopted in Decision 06-07-030 is consistent with Decision 05-12-045, and with AB 1890.

Although some of the Municipal Parties filed an application for rehearing of Decision 05-12-045, at one time municipal party representatives argued that the statutory method for calculating ongoing CTC should be applied to them. See, e.g., Opening Brief of the California Municipal Utilities Association on Municipal Departing Load Issues, (filed November 25, 2002 in R.02-01-011), pp. 36–37.

Therefore, the Commission did not act unlawfully in adopting that ratemaking approach for the non-bundled customers who are not responsible for the costs of DWR power. Municipal departing load (MDL), which the Municipal Parties represent, is typically (although not necessarily without exception) included in this category of non-bundled customer.

Decision 06-07-030 also addresses the DWR power charge component of the CRS. (Decision 06-07-030, pp. 24-27, 33-36.) It determines that for those non-bundled customers that are responsible for the costs of DWR power, their DWR power cost responsibility should be determined using an indifference calculation. (*Id.*) Because these customers are responsible for the costs of DWR power, the indifference calculation incorporates the cost of DWR power as well as the cost of utility power.

In part, the Commission relies on its earlier discussions regarding the purpose of the indifference calculation in making its determination in Decision 06-07-030 (a) to apply a total portfolio adjustment, involving utility and DWR procurement costs together, to non-bundled customers who are responsible for the costs of DWR power, and (b) not to apply a total portfolio adjustment, which would involve only utility procurement costs, to non-bundled customers who are exempt from responsibility for the costs of DWR power. As D.06-07-030 notes, Decision 05-01-035 made clear that the Commission intended the total portfolio methodology to apply to non-bundled customers responsible for the costs of DWR power, but that it not apply to non-bundled customers exempt from the costs of DWR power. (*Id.*, pp. 34-35.)

Unlike ongoing CTC cost recovery, the cost recovery approach for DWR power costs is not precisely mandated by statute. Application of the total portfolio methodology to the combined utility and DWR generation portfolios to determine the cost responsibility of non-bundled customers who are responsible for the costs of DWR power is not prohibited by statute.

Indeed, the Municipal Parties make no such claim. They are not arguing that the total portfolio approach applicable to non-bundled customers responsible for DWR power costs must be eliminated. Instead, they are arguing that a different total portfolio approach, one involving only utility costs, must be applied to the CRS obligations of non-bundled customers who are not responsible for the costs of DWR power, and that any other course of action is unlawful.

Thus, the question presented by the Municipal Parties' *Rehearing App'n* is whether the Commission can lawfully apply its adopted methodology for calculating the CRS obligations of non-bundled customers exempt from responsibility for the costs of DWR power, which does not include any total portfolio adjustment, *given* the fact that it is applying a lawful total portfolio approach to determine the obligations of non-bundled customers who are responsible for the costs of DWR power.

The answer to this question is clearly yes, and so the Municipal Parties' *Rehearing App'n* should be denied. The only law cited by the Municipal Parties is Public Utilities Code section 453, which states among other things that no public utility shall establish or maintain any unreasonable differences as to rates.

That statute does not, of course, prohibit all rate differences. If a rate difference bears a rational relationship to legitimate Commission goals, then it represents a proper exercise of the Commission's discretion. (*TURN v. CPUC* (1978) 22 C.3d 529, 543-44.)

The rates here easily meet this test, and are therefore lawful. The Commission must determine who is responsible for the costs of DWR power, and how the allocation of those costs affects the rates of all customers. The Commission's adopted approach here, the Power Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA), allocates the costs of DWR power between bundled customers, and those non-bundled customers who are responsible for the costs of DWR power. Non-

bundled customers who are exempt from the costs of DWR power do not enter into the picture. Their rates are not affected by the allocation of the DWR power costs. It is completely rational, and therefore completely consistent with section 453, for the Commission to adopt this approach.

The following sections address the specific arguments raised by the Municipal Parties in more detail, and demonstrate that none have any merit.

II. DECISION 06-07-030 DOES NOT UNLAWFULLY DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN TYPES OF DIRECT ACCESS AND DEPARTING LOAD CUSTOMERS

In their *Rehearing App'n* the Municipal Parties acknowledge that municipal departing load is being treated equivalently with direct access customers with respect to the determination of their responsibility for the costs of DWR power. They acknowledge that representatives of direct access customer interests agreed to the approach ultimately adopted by the Commission. They argue, however, that because they oppose the approach it should not be applied to them, even if it is applied to direct access customers. (*Rehearing App'n*, pp. 2-3.)

The fact that the Municipal Parties do not agree with an approach that all of the other parties agree is reasonable (i.e., that those exempt from responsibility for the costs of DWR power should pay the statutory ongoing CTC without a total portfolio adjustment) is simply not legal error.³

The Municipal Parties base their next assertion of legal error on the fact that Decision 05-12-045 stated that the issue of the total portfolio method to determine indifference costs would be addressed in this proceeding. (*Rehearing App'n*, p. 3.) There is no legal error. Decision 05-12-045 stated that the Commission would address the total portfolio as it relates to the

- 6 -

The Municipal Parties' assertion that D.06-07-030 relies upon the negotiated recommendation between investor owned utility and direct access parties to substantiate its adopted position on this issue is without merit. In D.05-01-035, issued long before the joint position was reached in connection with the *Working Group Report*, the Commission made the applicability of the total portfolio methodology contingent on whether the customer is responsible for paying the DWR power charge. *See* D.05-01-035, at p. 3.

indifference calculation in this proceeding. In this proceeding, in Decision 06-07-030, the Commission addressed this issue, as promised. Again, Municipal Parties' objection seems to boil down to the fact that they disagree with the result. But their disagreement is not grounds for finding legal error.

Next, the Municipal Parties' argue that in determining rates it is unlawful to distinguish between non-bundled customers who are responsible for the costs of DWR power, and those that are not. Therefore, they argue, a total portfolio adjustment should be applied to all. (*Rehearing App'n*, pp. 3-4.)

As discussed above, the Commission's adopted ratemaking approach allocating DWR cost responsibility between bundled customers, on the one hand, and non-bundled customers responsible for the costs of DWR power, on the other, is entirely rational and related to the Commission's legitimate goals. Therefore, the adopted approach is within the Commission's discretion, and not unlawful. Under the Commission's adopted approach, the rates paid by non-bundled customers exempt from responsibility for the costs of DWR power are not affected by the ratemaking mechanisms, including the total portfolio adjustment, used to establish responsibility for the costs of DWR power.

Indeed, the total portfolio calculation itself is entirely different with respect to those customers who are responsible for the costs of DWR power than it would be for those that are not. For those responsible for the costs of DWR power, DWR power costs are included along with the utility's costs of power in the calculation. For those not responsible for the costs of DWR power, the total portfolio calculation would not include DWR power costs, only the utility's costs of power. Therefore, even under the approach that the Municipal Parties advocate

there would be differences in the rates between those non-bundled customers who are responsible for the costs of DWR power, and those who are not.

In fact, the Commission has maintained different rates for non-bundled customers exempt from the DWR power charge, as compared with non-bundled customers who are not exempt, for quite some period of time. For PG&E under the 2.7 cent per kWh CRS cap, rates for exempt customers have been lower than rates for non-exempt customers. Thus, the fact that rates differ for the two groups does not indicate that the rates are unlawful. The Municipal Parties, whose MDL customers are, generally speaking, exempt from the costs of DWR power, have never objected to the rate distinction in the past.

The Municipal Parties' real objection is that beginning on September 1, 2006, for PG&E, all else equal, the rates of a non-bundled customer who bears responsibility for the costs of DWR power are lower than the rates of a non-bundled customer who is exempt from any responsibility for the costs of DWR power. However, the simple fact that rates are different for different classes of customers does not make them unlawful.

For PG&E's customers, until September 1, 2006, those non-bundled customers responsible for DWR power costs paid more, all else equal, than those who were not. Beginning September 1, 2006, non-exempt customers' rates have been lower. Depending on the conditions prevailing in the power market in the future, it may be that non-exempt customers' rates will again be higher. These rate variations, which the Municipal Parties' object to only when it means their rates may be higher, are not unlawful.

Finally, the Municipal Parties argue that "the bundled customer indifference standard applies to more than just the DWR power charge, or MDL would not be responsible for other CRS components, such as the DWR bond charge." (*Rehearing App'n*, p. 4.) The DWR bond

charge is set separately from both ongoing CTC and DWR power charge cost responsibility, and does not make use of a total portfolio or indifference calculation. In fact, it does not depend on ongoing power costs at all. There is nothing in the determination of the DWR bond charge that suggests that Decision 06-07-030 is unlawful.

III. DECISION 06-07-030 DOES NOT PROVIDE AN UNLAWFUL BUNDLED CUSTOMER WINDFALL

Simply stated, the Municipal Parties believe that by law, bundled customers must pay more for their service, and that municipal departing load should pay less. (*Rehearing App'n*, pp. 4-8.) There is no such legal requirement.

The *Rehearing App'n* challenges only the rates applicable to non-bundled customers who are exempt from DWR power costs. Focusing only on those rates, their CRS is built up from individual components, including ongoing CTC calculated pursuant to the clear direction provided by the Commission in Decision 05-12-045. None of these charges was changed as a result of Decision 06-07-030.

The Commission was acting well within its discretion to leave the method for determining those rates in place, and to focus on how to allocate DWR power cost responsibility between bundled customers, on the one hand, and non-bundled customers responsible for the costs of DWR power on the other. The Commission adopted the PCIA ratemaking mechanism to allocate costs between these two groups of customers.

The fact that the Commission placed certain cost responsibility on bundled customers under the PCIA ratemaking mechanism most certainly does not require, as a matter of law, that the Commission also place additional cost responsibilities on bundled customers, cost responsibilities that have nothing to do with DWR power costs or the PCIA ratemaking

mechanism, so that municipal departing load customers exempt from DWR charges can have lower rates.

The Municipal Parties start off their arguments by misstating how rates are calculated. They state that "CRS for [exempt] MDL is calculated differently than it is for direct access customers and other departing load customers." (*Rehearing App'n*, p. 4.) This statement is simply wrong. Decision 06-07-030 does not adopt any distinction among exempt non-bundled customers, whether they are direct access, customer generation departing load, or MDL. In particular, there is no total portfolio or indifference adjustment for any of these customer groups.

It is true that Decision 06-07-030 distinguishes between non-bundled load that is exempt from responsibility for the costs of DWR power, and non-bundled load that is not, in the determination of their CRS cost responsibilities. As previously discussed, that distinction is rational and well within the Commission's ratesetting authority.

The Municipal Parties then state that "the Commission committed legal error in D.06-07-030 by concluding that a different bundled customer indifference standard should apply to calculation of *CRS* for MDL customers who are exempt from the DWR power charge." (*Rehearing App'n*, p. 5.) As discussed above, it is well within the Commission's discretion to determine that no indifference calculation should apply to those non-bundled customers exempt from responsibility for DWR power costs, while using an indifference calculation, involving DWR as well as utility procurement costs, to allocate responsibility for DWR power costs between bundled customers on the one hand, and non-bundled customers responsible for DWR power costs on the other.

The Municipal Parties next appear to suggest that the Commission is required, by law, to set rates to achieve bundled customer indifference with respect to all departing load, regardless

of whether the departing load is responsible for the costs of DWR power. (*Rehearing App'n*, pp. 5-8.) There is no such mandate on the Commission.

Such an approach would be inconsistent with Decision 05-12-045 with respect to departing load exempt from responsibility for DWR power costs, as it would in effect calculate the ongoing CTC on a total portfolio basis for these customers. Decision 06-07-030 reaches the same conclusion. (Decision 06-07-030, p. 35.) However, regardless of whether the Commission could adopt such an approach, it is not obligated to do so. Therefore, Decision 06-07-030 is lawful.

The Municipal Parties cite Decisions 02-11-022 and 03-07-028 to support their argument that the Commission is required, by law, to set rates to achieve bundled customer indifference with respect to all departing load, regardless of whether the departing load is responsible for the costs of DWR power. (*Rehearing App'n*, pp. 6-7.) These decisions do not support the Municipal Parties' assertion that Decision 06-07-030 is unlawful. First, and foremost, the earlier decisions do not, and cannot, legally constrain the Commission so that it must now adopt a specified ratemaking approach, either the one urged on the Commission by the Municipal Parties or the one adopted in Decision 06-07-030.

Beyond that, it is far from clear that the decisions cited by the Municipal Parties even provide support for the Municipal Parties' position that, at the time these earlier decisions were issued, they anticipated some sort of indifference calculation be applied to the CRS applicable to all non-bundled customers, including those exempt from responsibility for DWR power costs. This argument ignores the fact that the context in which these decisions were issued was consideration of direct access and departing load's cost responsibility for DWR power costs.

Indeed, these decisions mark the beginning, not the end, of the Commission's investigation into how to establish CRS cost responsibility. Typically, one would look to later decisions such as Decisions 05-01-035 and 05-12-045, both cited by the Commission in Decision 06-07-030 (pp. 33-35) to provide clearer guidance as to the Commission's previous conclusions on these issues. In short, Decisions 02-11-022 and 03-07-028 do not suggest, let alone legally mandate, the approach the Municipal Parties urge on the Commission.

In sum, the Municipal Parties are incorrect in stating that Decision 06-07-030 results in a windfall to bundled customers. As discussed above, rates for a non-bundled customer who bears responsibility for the costs of DWR power are currently lower than the rates of a non-bundled customer who is exempt from any responsibility for the costs of DWR power. However, in the future, as market prices change and utility procurement costs change, an exempt non-bundled customer could in fact end up with lower rates than those of a non-exempt non-bundled customer. In either case, the result is not a windfall to bundled customers, but simply a difference in current rates, based on a reasonable ratemaking approach.

IV. THE COMMISSION DID NOT DENY THE MUNICIPAL PARTIES' DUE PROCESS RIGHTS IN ISSUING DECISION 06-07-030, AND THE MUNICIPAL PARTIES WERE CLEARLY ON NOTICE OF THE PROPOSALS ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION

The Municipal Parties object to the issuance of Decision 06-07-030 on procedural grounds, as well. Specifically, they argue that the "so-called 'revised' Draft Decision reversed the Draft Decision's holding on one of the major contested issues in the proceeding, namely the applicability of the total portfolio adjustment for MDL CRS obligations," and that the Municipal Parties had "no opportunity whatsoever to comment on Decision 06-07-030's reasoning or conclusion on the total portfolio adjustment issue." (*Rehearing App'n*, pp. 8-9.)

Contrary to the Municipal Parties' claims, the Commission's actions in issuing Decision 06-07-030 were fully consistent with its own rules and principles of due process. Pursuant to Rule 77.6, a "substantive revision to a proposed decision is not an 'alternate' if the revision *does no more than make changes suggested in prior comments on the proposed decision*." (Emphasis added.) As stated in Decision 06-07-030 (at pp. 48-49), the Commission took the parties comments "into account, and made various revisions as warranted, in finalizing this order.

Among other things, we have revised the Draft Decision regarding the applicability of the total portfolio adjustment for MDL CRS obligations...." Under its own rules, the Commission was not required to re-circulate the revised Draft Decision for further comment.⁴

In addition, the Municipal Parties' claim that they had "no opportunity to comment on Decision 06-07-030's reasoning" simply is not true. This issue has been framed, and contested, at least since the preparation of the *Report* referenced on page 4 of Decision 06-07-030, which was incorporated into the record on February 23, 2006. Section II-B of the *Report* includes the recommendations that the Municipal Parties now argue are legally mandated, that an indifference calculation be applied to departing load customers exempt from responsibility for the costs of DWR power. The investor owned utilities made it clear in the *Report* that they opposed that recommendation, and supported the approach that has now been adopted by Decision 06-07-030.

_

In Decision 00-01-053, the Commission addressed the issue of "alternates" and explained why a revised decision that adopts changes recommended in comments on a draft decision does not require a second round of review and comment:

SB 779 does not require mechanically issuing for public review and comment all versions of an item that may appear on the Commission's agenda....We cannot possibly meet the directives of SB 960 [regarding timely decisions] if we implement SB 779 in such a way as to allow the comment process under the latter statute to become the longest part of the proceeding. ... Where the revision follows easily and directly from the prior comment or prior alternate, we see no public interest that would be served...by subjecting the revision to yet another round of public review and comment. (D. 00-01-053, pp. 8-11.)

As described in Decision 06-07-030 (p. 5), opening and reply comments on the *Report* were filed on March 8, 2006, and March 17, 2006, respectively. Not surprisingly, one of the areas these comments focused on was whether an indifference calculation should be applied to departing load customers exempt from responsibility for the costs of DWR power.

Finally, this topic was also the focus of opening and reply comments on the Draft Decision of the ALJ. PG&E and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) filed joint comments on this topic. Among other things these joint comments pointed out the inconsistency between the Draft Decision's treatment of DWR-exempt direct access customers, on the one hand, and DWR-exempt MDL customers, on the other. Parties representing municipal departing load filed reply comments on the Draft Decision.

In short, this topic was commented upon and briefed extensively. All parties, including the Municipal Parties, had the opportunity to present their positions. It was neither necessary under the Commission's rules to re-issue the Draft Decision for further comment, nor would anything have been gained by the Commission had it done so.

The issues surrounding how to calculate the CRS have been litigated for several years. Hundreds of pages of Commission decisions have been issued on the topic. In light of the complexity of the matter, the Commission asked the interested parties to work together, in a Working Group, to resolve issues to the extent possible. All of the parties, with the exception of the MDL parties, were able to compromise their original positions and present comprehensive joint recommendations to the Commission.

The MDL parties were not able to reach agreement with anyone. There is no problem with that, agreements are not always possible. Given the lack of agreement, parties were provided the opportunity to file comments on the *Report* to address contested issues to ensure

that the Commission would have a complete record upon which to issue its decision. Now the Commission has issued that decision. The Municipal Parties preferred the Draft Decision, but the fact that they did not obtain the result they wanted does not constitute procedural error on the Commission's part.

Based on the facts here, and in particular the multiple opportunities for comment provided to all of the interested parties in the proceedings leading up to Decision 06-07-030, the Municipal Parties simply cannot support their allegations that the parties were not provided any reasonable notice and opportunity to comment on the issues decided by Decision 06-07-030. Indeed, the *Rehearing App'n* is completely devoid of any suggestion by the Municipal Parties that they have any additional information to offer in support of their position. The parties have been treated fairly; no basis for rehearing on lack of notice or procedural due process grounds has been demonstrated.

///

///

V. CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, PG&E and SCE respectfully request that the Municipal Parties' application for rehearing of Decision 06-07-030 be denied.

Respectfully Submitted,

MARK R. HUFFMAN ANN KIM

By: /s/

MARK R. HUFFMAN

Pacific Gas and Electric Company 77 Beale Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 973-3842

Fax: (415) 973-0516 E-mail: mrh2@pge.com

Attorneys for PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

On behalf of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY and PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

September 5, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

I, the undersigned, state that I am a citizen of the United States and am employed in the City and County of San Francisco; that I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within cause; and that my business address is Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Law Department B30A, 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

On the 5th day of September, 2006, I served a true copy of:

JOINT RESPONSE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICATION FOR REHEARING OF DECISION 06-07-030

by electronic mail to all parties to R. 02-01-011 providing an e-mail address.

I certify and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on the 5th day of September, 2006.

/s/ LINDA S. DANNEWITZ

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS

517-B POTRERO AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110 Email: Cem@newsdata.com Status: INFORMATION

CASE ADMINISTRATION LAW DEPARTMENT SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE, RM 370

ROSEMEAD CA 91770 Email: case.admin@sce.com Status: INFORMATION

JEANNE B. ARMSTRONG ATTORNEY

GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Enron Energy Services, Inc/Enron Energy Marketing

Corp

Email: jarmstrong@gmssr.com Status: APPEARANCE

Oldido: 711 1 E7110 1110

Kathryn Auriemma

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

RATEMAKING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: kdw@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

WILLIAM T. BAGLEY ATTORNEY

NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT

50 CALIFORNIA ST, 34TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799 FOR: Poseidon Resources Corporation Email: jguzman@nossaman.com

Status: APPEARANCE

R. THOMAS BEACH PRINCIPAL CONSULTANT

CROSSBORDER ENERGY 2560 NINTH ST, STE 316 BERKELEY CA 94710

Email: tomb@crossborderenergy.com

Status: APPEARANCE

SCOTT BLAISING ATTORNEY **BRAUN & BLAISING**, **P.C**.

915 L ST, STE. 1420 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: Power and Water Resources Pooling Authority

(PWRPA)

Email: blaising@braunlegal.com

Status: APPEARANCE

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

MAILCODE B30A PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

Email: cpuccases@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

MICHAEL ALCANTAR ATTORNEY

ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP 1300 SW FIFTH AVE, STE 1750 PORTLAND OR 97201

FOR: Cogeneration Association of California (CAC)

Email: mpa@a-klaw.com Status: APPEARANCE

Peter Arth, Jr.

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5300 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: paj@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

MICHAEL A. BACKSTROM ATTORNEY

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770

FOR: Southern Calirornia Edison Company

Email: michael.backstrom@sce.com

Status: APPEARANCE

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.

44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE MENDOCINO CA 95460

FOR: CLECA

Email: brbarkovich@earthlink.net

Status: APPEARANCE

C. SUSIE BERLIN ATTORNEY MC CARTHY & BERLIN, LLP

100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, STE 501

SAN JOSE CA 95113

FOR: City of San Marcos/Turlock Irrigation

Email: sberlin@mccarthylaw.com

Status: APPEARANCE

WILLIAM BLATTNER ADMINSTRATOR STATE REG.

RELATIONS

SEMPRA ENERGY

601 VAN NESS AVE, STE 2060 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: wblattner@sempra.com Status: INFORMATION

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

JERRY R. BLOOM ATTORNEY

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

555 CALIFORNIA ST STE. 1000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104-1513

FOR: California Cogeneration Council

Email: jbloom@whitecase.com

Status: APPEARANCE

WILLIAM H. BOOTH ATTORNEY LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH

1500 NEWELL ST, 5TH FLR WALNUT CREEK CA 94596

FOR: CLECA - California Large Energy Consumers

Association

Email: wbooth@booth-law.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Jonathan Bromson

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

LEGAL DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4107 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jab@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

ANDY BROWN

ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: abb@eslawfirm.com Status: APPEARANCE

JAMES E. BURKE 125 WAWONA ST.

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94127 Email: jim@prudens.com Status: INFORMATION

DAVID J. BYERS ATTORNEY

MCCRACKEN, BYERS & HAESLOOP

1528 SO. EL CAMINO REAL, STE 306

SAN MATEO CA 94402

FOR: California City-County Street Light Association

Email: dbyers@landuselaw.com.

Status: APPEARANCE

DAN L. CARROLL ATTORNEY **DOWNEY BRAND, LLP**

555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLR SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: Central Valley Project Group Email: dcarroll@downeybrand.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Christopher J. Blunt

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

FOR: ORA

Email: cjb@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JUSTIN D. BRADLEY DIRECTOR

SILICON VALLEY LEADERSHIP GROUP

224 AIRPORT PARKWAY, STE 620

SAN JOSE CA 95110

FOR: SILICON VALLEY MANUFACTURING GROUP

Email: jbradley@svlg.net Status: APPEARANCE

ANDREW BROWN ATTORNEY

ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

Email: abb@eslawfirm.com Status: APPEARANCE

MAURICE BRUBAKER

BRUBAKER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1215 FERN RIDGE PARKWAY, STE 208

ST. LOUIS MO 63141

FOR: Brubaker & Associates, Inc. Email: mbrubaker@consultbai.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JAMES H. BUTZ

AIR PRODUCTS AND CHEMICALS, INC.

7201 HAMILTON BLVD. ALLENTOWN PA 18195 Email: butzjh@apci.com Status: APPEARANCE

Andrew Campbell

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5304 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: agc@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

SEAN CASEY

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSIO

1155 MARKET ST, 4TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 Email: scasey@sfwater.org Status: INFORMATION

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

ANDREW S. CHEUNG ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

333 S. BEAUDRY AVE., 20TH FLR

LOS ANGELES CA 90017

Email: andrew.cheung@lausd.net

Status: INFORMATION

JOSEPH PETER COMO

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CITY HALL, ROOM 234

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM. 234

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: joe.como@sfgov.org Status: INFORMATION

Judy Cooper

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

PUBLIC ADVISOR OFFICE 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 2-B SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jms@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

LISA A. COTTLE ATTORNEY

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

101 CALIFORNIA ST. 39TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Simpson Timber Company Email: lcottle@winston.com

Status: APPEARANCE

BRIAN T. CRAGG ATTORNEY

GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, RITCHIE & DAY

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles

Email: bcragg@gmssr.com Status: APPEARANCE

CHAD CURRAN ENERGY REVENUE REQUIREMENTS

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

Email: crcq@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

JOHN DALESSI

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.

3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078 Email: jdalessi@navigantconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

JANET COMBS ATTORNEY

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770

FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

Email: janet.combs@sce.com

Status: APPEARANCE

CHRISTOPHER CONKLING GENERAL COUNSEL

USS-POSCO INDUSTRIES 900 LOVERIDGE ROAD PITTSBURG CA 94565

Email: cconklin@ussposco.com

Status: APPEARANCE

THOMAS CORR **SEMPRA ENERGY**

101 ASH ST, HQ 08

SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017

Email: tcorr@sempraglobal.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Kevin P. Coughlan

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

WATER DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 3102 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: kpc@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

THOMAS CROOKS

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.

3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078 FOR: NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC. Email: tcrooks@navigantconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROGER CURTIS

MACY'S WEST

35 OFARRELL ST, 6TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 4102 Email: roger.curtis@FDS.com

Status: INFORMATION

ANDREW DALTON COUNSEL, ENVIRON SAFETY &

REGULATORY AFF

VALERO ENERGY COMPANY

PO BOX 696000

SAN ANTONIO TX 78269-6000 Email: Andrew.dalton@valero.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

Christopher Danforth

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: ctd@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

KAY DAVOODI

NAVY UTILITY RATES AND STUDIES OFFICE

1322 PATTERSON AVE., SE - BLDG. 33 WASHINGTON NAVY YARD DC 20374-5018

FOR: Navy Rate Intervention Email: khojasteh.davoodi@navy.mil

Status: APPEARANCE

Regina DeAngelis

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

LEGAL DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4107 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: rmd@cpuc.ca.gov Status: INFORMATION

BRIAN DELAMER

CAPSTONE TURBINE CORPORATION

21211 NORDHOFF ST CHATSWORTH CA 91311

Email: bdelamer@capstonturbine.com

Status: INFORMATION

DAVE DIETRICH

DAVIS ENERGY GROUP

123 C ST

DAVIS CA 95616

Status: INFORMATION

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS ATTORNEY

DOUGLASS & LIDDELL

21700 OXNARD ST, STE 1030 WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367

FOR: AReM; WPTF

Email: douglass@energyattorney.com

Status: APPEARANCE

ANNE FALCON

EES CONSULTING, INC.

570 KIRKLAND AVE KIRLAND WA 98033

Email: rfp@eesconsulting.com Status: INFORMATION MICHAEL J. DAPONDE ATTORNEY

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

400 CAPITOL MALL, STE 1700 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: Westside Power Authority

Email: mdaponde@pillsburywinthrop.com

Status: APPEARANCE

MICHAEL B. DAY ATTORNEY

GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Enron Energy Service, Inc., Enron North America

Corp.

Email: mday@gmssr.com Status: APPEARANCE

LISA DECARLO STAFF COUNSEL

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 9TH ST MS-14 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

Email: Idecarlo@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

RALPH DENNIS DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS

FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES

9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE, STE 2000

LOUISVILLE KY 40223

Email: ralph.dennis@constellation.com

Status: INFORMATION

Paul Douglas

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: psd@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

GORDON P. ERSPAMER ATTORNEY

MORRISON & FOERSTER

101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, STE 450 WALNUT CREEK CA 94596-8130 FOR: AES NewEnergy, Inc.

Email: gerspamer@mofo.com Status: INFORMATION

STEVEN D. FARKAS

PARAMOUNT PETROLEUM CORPORATION

14700 DOWNEY AVE PARAMOUNT CA 90723 Email: SFarkas@ppcla.com Status: APPEARANCE

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

CENTRAL FILES

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC

8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP31E

SAN DIEGO CA 92123

FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC Email: centralfiles@semprautilities.com

Status: INFORMATION

Julie A. Fitch

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5203 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jf2@cpuc.ca.gov

Status: STATE-SERVICE

MATTHEW FREEDMAN ATTORNEY

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

711 VAN NESS AVE, STE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

Email: freedman@turn.org

Status: APPEARANCE

David M. Gamson

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 2251 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: dmg@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

DAN GEIS

AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSO.

925 L ST, STE 800

SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: dgeis@dolphingroup.org

Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT B. GEX ATTORNEY,

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

505 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533

FOR: SF Bary Area Rapid Transit District

Email: bobgex@dwt.com Status: APPEARANCE

ROGER GOLDSTEIN

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PG&E MAIL CODE B9A

PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

Email: rfg2@pge.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT FINKELSTEIN ATTORNEY THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK 711 VAN NESS AVE., STE 350

711 VAN NESS AVE., STE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

FOR: TURN

Email: bfinkelstein@turn.org

Status: APPEARANCE

MICHEL PETER FLORIO ATTORNEY
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

711 VAN NESS AVE, STE 350

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

FOR: TURN - The Utility Reform Network

Email: mflorio@turn.org Status: APPEARANCE

Status: APPEARANCE

NORMAN J. FURUTA

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

10TH FLOOR, MS 1021A

333 MARKET ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-2195

FOR: Federal Executive Agencies Email: norman.furuta@navy.mil

Status: APPEARANCE

PETE GARRIS

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

3310 EL CAMINO AVE, STE 120

SACRAMENTO CA 95821

Status: INFORMATION

JACQUELINE GEORGE CALIFORNIA ENERGY

RESOURCES SCHEDULING

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

3310 EL CAMINO AVE, RM. 120

SACRAMENTO CA 95821

FOR: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER

RESOURCES

Email: jgeorge@water.ca.gov

Status: STATE-SERVICE

JENNY GLUZGOLD

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

PO BOX 770000, RM. 987 - B9A

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

Email: yxg4@pge.com

Status: INFORMATION

HOWARD V. GOLUB

NIXON PEABODY LLP

2 EMBARCADERO CENTER, STE. 2700

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: THE PORT OF STOCKTON

Email: hgolub@nixonpeabody.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

MARCO GOMEZ ATTORNEY
S.F. BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT

PO BOX 12688

OAKLAND CA 94604-2688 Email: mgomez1@bart.gov Status: APPEARANCE

STEVEN F. GREENWALD ATTORNEY **DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP** 505 MONTGOMERY ST, STE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533

FOR: Guardian Industries Corp. Email: stevegreenwald@dwt.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JOSE GUZMAN

NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP

50 CALIFORNIA ST, 34TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799

FOR: City of Irvine

Email: jguzman@nossaman.com

Status: APPEARANCE

PETER W. HANSCHEN ATTORNEY MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, STE 450

WALNUT CREEK CA 94596

FOR: Agriculture Energy Consumers Association

Email: phanschen@mofo.com Status: APPEARANCE

Peter Hanson

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4104 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: pgh@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

LYNN M. HAUG ATTORNEY **ELLISON & SCHNEIDER**

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814-3109 FOR: CITY OF INDUSTRY Email: Imh@eslawfirm.com Status: APPEARANCE

CHRISTINE HENNING ALLIANCE POWER INC.

3511 J ST UPPER EAST SACRAMENTO CA 95816

Email: christine-henning@alliancepower.com

Status: INFORMATION

JEFFREY E. GRAY SENIOR CORPORATE COUNSEL

LOWE'S COMPANIES, INC.

PO BOX 1111

NORTH WILKESBORO NC 28656 Email: jeff.e.gray@lowes.com Status: APPEARANCE

KAREN GRIFFIN EXECUTIVE OFFICE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 9TH ST, MS 39 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: kgriffin@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

DAN HALPERIN

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 770000, B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: dmhq@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

GEORGE HANSON ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

CITY OF CORONA

730 CORPORATION YARD WAY

CORONA CA 92880 FOR: City of Corona

Email: george.hanson@ci.corona.ca.us

Status: APPEARANCE

LYNN HAUG

ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 FOR: City of Hercules Email: Imh@eslawfirm.com Status: APPEARANCE

GREGORY HEIERTZ

IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT

15600 SAND CANYON AVE

IRVINE CA 92619

Email: heiertz@irwd.com Status: INFORMATION

JOHN A. HIGLEY MANAGING PARTNER

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENTERPRISES

1028 FARM BROOK LN NE ATLANTA GA 30319-4562 Email: energyhig@aol.com Status: INFORMATION

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

CHRISTOPHER A. HILEN ATTORNEY **DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP** 505 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533 Email: chrishilen@dwt.com

Status: INFORMATION

MICHAEL H. HINDUS ATTORNEY PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

50 FREMONT ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

FOR: Westside Power Authority/SBC Pacific Bell

Email: mhindus@pillsburywinthrop.com

Status: APPEARANCE

RENEE HOFFMAN **CITY OF ANAHEIM**

PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT 201 S. ANAHEIM BLVD., STE 902

ANAHEIM CA 92805

Email: rhoffman@anaheim.net Status: INFORMATION

Martin Homec

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4205 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: mxh@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

DAVID L. HUARD ATTORNEY MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP

11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD LOS ANGELES CA 90064

FOR: LA Unified School District, City of Corona, Del Taco, Inc. Lowes Home Improvement Warehouse, et al

Email: dhuard@manatt.com Status: APPEARANCE

ELIZABETH WAGNE HULL DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

CITY OF CHULA VISTA 276 FOURTH AVE CHULA VISTA CA 91910 FOR: CITY OF CHULA VISTA Email: ehull@ci.chula-vista.ca.us

Status: INFORMATION

MIKE JASKE

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 NINTH ST, MS-22 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: mjaske@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

SETH HILTON ATTORNEY

STOEL RIVES

111 SUTTER ST., STE 700 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 FOR: El Paso Merchant Energy Email: sdhilton@stoel.com Status: APPEARANCE

ROCKY HO

FTI CONSULTING

353 SACRAMENTO ST. STE 1800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 FOR: FTI CONSULTING Email: rocky.ho@fticonsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

PAUL V. HOLTON

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177-0001

FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Email: pvh1@pge.com Status: APPEARANCE

LON W. HOUSE ENERGY ADVISOR

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES

4901 FLYING C ROAD

CAMERON PARK CA 95682-9615

FOR: Association of California Water Agencies

Email: lwhouse@innercite.com Status: INFORMATION

MARK R. HUFFMAN ATTORNEY

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

B₃₀A

PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

FOR: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Email: mrh2@pge.com Status: APPEARANCE

Louis M. Irwin

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: Imi@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

MARC D. JOSEPH ATTORNEY

ADAMS, BROADWELL, JOSEPH & CARDOZO

601 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 1000 SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080 Email: mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

BILL JULIAN

OFFICE OF STATE SENATOR MARTHA ESCUTIA

STATE CAPITOL, RM 5080 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: bill.julian@sen.ca.gov Status: APPEARANCE

KURT J. KAMMERER

K. J. KAMMERER & ASSOCIATES

PO BOX 60738

SAN DIEGO CA 92166-8738 Email: kjk@kjkammerer.com Status: INFORMATION

RANDALL W. KEEN ATTORNEY **MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP**

11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD. LOS ANGELES CA 90064

FOR: Kern Oil & Refining Co./Paramount Petroleum

Co./Los Angeles Unified School

Email: pucservice@manatt.com Status: APPEARANCE

WENDY KEILANI

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC

8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32D

SAN DIEGO CA 92123

Email: wkeilani@semprautilities.com

Status: APPEARANCE

WENDELL KIDO 10545 ARMSTRONG AVE

MATHER CA 95655

FOR: Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District

Email: kidow@saccounty.net Status: APPEARANCE

ANN H. KIM ATTORNEY

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

77 BEALE ST, RM 3101 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

FOR: PG&E

Email: ahk4@pge.com Status: APPEARANCE

Robert Kinosian

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ORA - ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4205 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: gig@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE **EVELYN KAHL ATTORNEY ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP**

120 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

FOR: Energy Producers and Users Coalition

Email: ek@a-klaw.com Status: APPEARANCE

JEFF KASPAR DEPUTY PORT DIRECTOR OF

PROPERTY & ENVIR PORT OF STOCKTON 2201 W. WASHINGTON ST STOCKTON CA 95203-2942 FOR: PORT OF STOCKTON

Email: jkaspar@stockport.com Status: APPEARANCE

CAROLYN KEHREIN

ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

1505 DUNLAP COURT DIXON CA 95620-4208 FOR: Energy Users Forum Email: cmkehrein@ems-ca.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Dexter E. Khoury

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: bsl@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

ANGELA KIM

FTI CONSULTING

353 SACRAMENTO ST, STE 1800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 FOR: FTI CONSULTING

Email: angela.kim@fticonsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

CHRIS KING

CALIFORNIA CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT ALLIANCE

842 OXFORD ST BERKELEY CA 94707 Email: chris@emeter.com Status: INFORMATION

GREGORY KLATT ATTORNEY DOUGLASS & LIDDELL

411 E. HUNTINGTON DRIVE, STE 107-356

ARCADIA CA 91007 FOR: AREM/WPTF

Email: klatt@energyattorney.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

JAMES KOONTZ

GRIFFITH & MASUDA
517 E. OLIVE ST

TURLOCK CA 95380

FOR: Turlock Irrigation District Email: jkoontz@calwaterlaw.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Donald J. Lafrenz

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

RATEMAKING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: dlf@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

DIANA LAI

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

MAIL CODE B9A PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: dyl1@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

DONALD C. LIDDELL P. C. DOUGLASS & LIDDELL

2928 2ND AVE

SAN DIEGO CA 92103

Email: liddell@energyattorney.com

Status: INFORMATION

KAREN LINDH

LINDH & ASSOCIATES

7909 WALERGA ROAD, NO. 112, PMB119

ANTELOPE CA 95843 FOR: Industrial customers Email: karen@klindh.com Status: INFORMATION

BARRY LOVELL

BERRY PETROLEUM COMOPANY

PO BOX 925 TAFT CA 93268 Email: bjl@bry.com Status: APPEARANCE

WILLIAM MARCUS JBS ENERGY, INC. 311 D ST, STE A

WEST SACRAMENTO CA 95605

FOR: JBS Energy Email: bill@jbsenergy.com Status: APPEARANCE Laura L. Krannawitter

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5303 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: Ilk@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JERRY LAHR PROGRAM MANAGER

ABAG POWER 101 EIGHT ST

OAKLAND CA 94607-4756 Email: JerryL@abag.ca.gov Status: INFORMATION

JOHN LESLIE ATTORNEY

LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS

11988 EL CAMINO REAL, STE 200

SAN DIEGO CA 92130 FOR: Callaway Golf Email: jleslie@luce.com Status: APPEARANCE

RONALD LIEBERT ATTORNEY

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE SACRAMENTO CA 95833

FOR: California Farm Bureau Federation

Email: rliebert@cfbf.com Status: APPEARANCE

LAWRENCE LINGBLOOM CONSULTANT

SENATE ENERGY/UTILITIES & COMMUNICATION

STATE CAPITOL, RM 4040 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: lawrence.lingbloom@sen.ca.gov

Status: INFORMATION

LYNELLE LUND GENERAL COUNSEL

COMMERCE ENERGY, INC. 600 ANTON BLVD., STE 2000 COSTA MESA CA 92626

Email: Ilund@commerceenergy.com

Status: APPEARANCE

MARTIN A. MATTES ATTORNEY

NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP

50 CALIFORNIA ST, 34TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799 FOR: Jack in the Box Inc. Email: mmattes@nossaman.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

CHRISTOPHER J. MAYER

MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

PO BOX 4060

MODESTO CA 95352-4060 FOR: Modesto Irrigation District

Email: chrism@mid.org Status: APPEARANCE

BARRY F. MCCARTHY MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP

100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, STE 501

SAN JOSE CA 95113

FOR: Northern California Power Agency

Email: bmcc@mccarthylaw.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JEANNE MCKINNEY ATTORNEY

THELEN REID & PRIEST 101 SECOND ST, STE 1800

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

FOR: THELEN REID & PRIEST Email: jmckinney@thelenreid.com

Status: INFORMATION

JAMES MCMAHON SENIOR ENGAGEMENT MANAGER

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.

3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078

Email: JMcMahon@navigantconsulting.com

Status: STATE-SERVICE

GARY A. MEYER A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION PARKER, MILLIKEN, CLARK, O'HARA&SAMUELIAN

333 SOUTH HOPE ST, 27TH FLR LOS ANGELES CA 90071-1488

FOR: AMERICAN YEAST CORPORATION

Email: gmeyer@pmcos.com Status: INFORMATION

WILLIAM A. MOGEL

1025 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, N.W.

STE 425W

WASHINGTON DC 20007

Email: wmogel@saul.com Status: APPEARANCE

IRENE K. MOOSEN ATTORNEY

53 SANTA YNEZ AVE

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94112 FOR: University of California Email: irene@igc.org

Status: APPEARANCE

RICHARD MCCANN

M.CUBED

2655 PORTAGE BAY ROAD, STE 3

DAVIS CA 95616

Email: rmccann@umich.edu Status: INFORMATION

KEITH MCCREA ATTORNEY

SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN

1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004-2415

FOR: California Manufacturers&Technology Assoc.

Email: keith.mccrea@sablaw.com

Status: APPEARANCE

BRUCE MCLAUGHLIN

BRAUN & BLAISING P.C.

915 L ST, STE 1420 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: California Municipal Utilities Association/Power and

Water Resources

Email: blaising@braunlegal.com

Status: APPEARANCE

MEG MEAL

120 JERSEY ST SAN FRANCISCO CA 94114

Email: megmeal@aol.com

Status: INFORMATION

KAREN NORENE MILLS ATTORNEY

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE SACRAMENTO CA 95833

FOR: California Farm Bureau Federation

Email: kmills@cfbf.com Status: APPEARANCE

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA ATTORNEY

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770

Email: mike.montoya@sce.com

Status: INFORMATION

TRACH L. MORGAN

COMMERCE ENERGY/ELECTRICAMERICA

600 ANTON BLVD., STE. 2000 COSTA MESA CA 92626

FOR: COMMERCE ENERGY/ELECTRICAMERICA

Email: tmorgan@electric.com Status: INFORMATION

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

KELLY M. MORTON ATTORNEY **SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC**

101 ASH ST

SAN DIEGO CA 92123 Email: kmorton@sempra.com Status: INFORMATION

RICHARD MRLIK INTERTIE

2130 FILLMORE ST, 211 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94115 FOR: City of Industry Email: rmrlik@intertie.com Status: APPEARANCE

MARIC MUNN OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 1111 FRANKLIN ST, 6TH FLR OAKLAND CA 94607

Email: maric.munn@ucop.edu Status: APPEARANCE

RITA NORTON

RITA NORTON AND ASSOCIATES, LLC

18700 BLYTHSWOOD DRIVE, LOS GATOS CA 95030

FOR: RITA NORTON & ASSOCIATES Email: rita@ritanortonconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

PETER OUBORG ATTORNEY

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 7442 MAIL CODE B30A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120

FOR: PG&E

Email: pxo2@pge.com Status: APPEARANCE

RAJ N. PANKHANIA

HERCULES MUNICIPAL UTILITY

111 CIVIC DRIVE HERCULES CA 94547

FOR: HERCULES MUNICIPAL UTILITY

Status: APPEARANCE

COLIN L. PEARCE ATTORNEY

DUANE MORRIS LLP

1 MARKET PLAZA, SPEAR TOWER, STE 2000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105 FOR: Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. Email: clpearce@duanemorris.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JAMES MOSHER **AREA ENERGY LLC** 10000 MING AVE

BAKERSFIELD CA 93311

Email: jpmosher@aeraenergy.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JACKSON W. MUELLER, JR. JACKSON W. MUELLER, JR., LLC

PO BOX 6009

IRVINE CA 92616-9009 Email: jwmueller@attglobal.net

Status: INFORMATION

SARA STECK MYERS ATTORNEY

LAW OFFICES OF SARA STECK MYERS

122 - 28TH AVE

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121 Email: ssmyers@att.net Status: APPEARANCE

EDWARD W. O'NEILL ATTORNEY **DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP**

505 MONTGOMERY ST, STE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533

FOR: California Solar Energy Industries Association

Email: edwardoneill@dwt.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JOHN PACHECO CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES

SCHEDULING

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

3310 EL CAMINO AVE, STE 120 SACRAMENTO CA 95821 Email: jpacheco@water.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

MONA PATEL

BROWN & WOOD LLP

555 CALIFORNIA ST, 50TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: mpatel@sidley.com Status: INFORMATION

NORMAN A. PEDERSEN ATTORNEY

HANNA AND MORTON LLP

444 SOUTH FLOWER ST, STE 1500 LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2916 FOR: STRATEGIC ENERGY. L.L.C. Email: npedersen@hanmor.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

AMY PETERS REGULATORY CASE ADMINISTRATOR

SEMPRA ENERGY UTILITIES

8330 CENTURY PARK COURT - CP32D

SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1530 FOR: San Diego Gas & Electric Email: apeters@semprautilities.com

Status: INFORMATION

SARA PICTOU EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT OAK CREEK ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.

14633 WILLOW SPRINGS ROAD

MOJAVE CA 93501

Email: sara@oakcreekenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

Thomas R. Pulsifer

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5016 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: trp@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

CHARLES C. READ ATTORNEY

O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP

400 SOUTH HOPE ST LOS ANGELES CA 90071 Email: cread@omm.com

Status: INFORMATION

Jonathan J. Reiger

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

LEGAL DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5035 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jzr@cpuc.ca.gov Status: APPEARANCE

MICHAEL ROCHMAN

SCHOOL PROJECT UTILITY RATE REDUCTION

1430 WILLOW PASS ROAD, STE 240

CONCORD CA 94520

Email: rochmanm@spurr.org Status: INFORMATION

Steve Roscow

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

RATEMAKING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: scr@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE LON L. PETERS

NORTHWEST ECONOMIC RESEARCH, INC.

624 S.E. ANDOVER PLACE PORTLAND OR 97202-9006

FOR: NORTHWEST ECONOMIC RESEARCH, INC.

Email: lpeters@pacifier.com Status: INFORMATION

EDWARD G. POOLE ATTORNEY

ANDERSON & POOLE

601 CALIFORNIA ST, STE 1300 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108-2818

FOR: California Independent Petroleum Assoc. (CIPA)

Email: epoole@adplaw.com Status: APPEARANCE

ERIN RANSLOW

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.

3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078

Email: cpucrulings@navigantconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT REDLINGER CHEVRON ENERGY SOLUTIONS

CHEVRON TEXACO

345 CALIFORNIA ST. 32ND FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

Email: rredlinger@chevrontexaco.com

Status: INFORMATION

STUART ROBERTSON

ROBERTSON-BRYAN, INC

9888 KENT ST

ELK GROVE CA 95624-9483

FOR: Central Valley Project Group Email: stuart@robertson-bryan.com

Status: APPEARANCE

HAROLD M. ROMANOWITZ

OAK CREEK ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.

14633 WILLOW SPRINGS ROAD

MOJAVE CA 93501 Email: hal@rwitz.net Status: INFORMATION

JOHN ROSENBAUM

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

555 CALIFORNIA ST STE. 1000 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104-1513 FOR: California Cogeneration Council

Email: jrosenbaum@whitecase.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

JAMES ROSS THUMS

REGULATORY & COGENERATION SERVICES, INC.

500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, STE 320

CHESTERFIELD MO 63017 Email: jimross@r-c-s-inc.com Status: APPEARANCE

DIANE RUNNING RESEARCH ANALYST

EES CONSULTING, INC. 570 KIRKLAND WAY, STE 200 KIRKLAND WA 98033-2471 Email: running@eesconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROGER RUSSELL

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

RM. 902, MAIL CODE B9A PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Email: rlr2@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

WILLIAM P. SCHARFENBERG

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004-2400

Email: billscharfenberg@paulhastings.com

Status: INFORMATION

REED V. SCHMIDT

BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES

1889 ALCATRAZ AVE BERKELEY CA 94703-2714

FOR: California City-County Street Light Assoc.

Email: rschmidt@bartlewells.com

Status: APPEARANCE

MICHAEL SHAMES ATTORNEY

UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK

3100 FIFTH AVE, STE B SAN DIEGO CA 92103 Email: mshames@ucan.org Status: INFORMATION

NORA SHERIFF ATTORNEY ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP

120 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

FOR: EPUC/KCC/GAG Email: nes@a-klaw.com Status: APPEARANCE **ROB ROTH**

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

6201 S ST MS 75

SACRAMENTO CA 95817 Email: rroth@smud.org Status: INFORMATION

STEVEN P. RUSCH 5640 S. FAIRFAX

LOS ANGELES CA 90056 FOR: Stocker Resources Email: srusch@plainsxp.com Status: APPEARANCE

J.A. SAVAGE

CALIFORNIA ENERGY CIRCUIT

3006 SHEFFIELD AVE OAKLAND CA 94602

Email: editorial@californiaenergycircuit.net

Status: INFORMATION

STEVE SCHLEIMER

CALPINE CORPORATION

3875 HOPYARD ROAD, STE 345 PLEASANTON CA 94588

Email: sschleimer@calpine.com

Status: APPEARANCE

DONALD R. SCHOONOVER ATTORNEY

PACIFIC TELESIS GROUP 2600 CAMINO RAMON, 2W805 SAN RAMON CA 94583

FOR: California Large Energy COnsumers Association

Email: ds1957@camail.sbc.com

Status: APPEARANCE

Karen M. Shea

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

RATEMAKING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: kms@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JENNIFER SHIGEKAWA ATTORNEY

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770

FOR: SCE

Email: Jennifer.Shigekawa@sce.com

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN

ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

646 EAST THIRD AVE DURANGO CO 81301

FOR: EMS

Email: kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com

Status: INFORMATION

RALPH SMITH

LARKIN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

15728 FARMINGTON ROAD

LIVONIA MI 48154

FOR: Larkin & Associates, Inc. Email: filings@hotmail.com

Status: INFORMATION

JOSEPH STAGNER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

ONE SHIELDS AVE DAVIS CA 95616

Email: josephs@pplant.ucdavis.edu

Status: APPEARANCE

JOANNA STONE POOLE **REAL ENERGY INC.**

6712 WASHINGTON ST YOUNTVILLE CA 94599-1303 Email: jpoole@realenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

PATRICIA THOMPSON

SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING

1766 LACASSIE AVE. STE 103 WALNUT CREEK CA 94596

Email: pthompson@summitblue.com

Status: INFORMATION

SCOTT TOMASHEFSKY

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY

180 CIRBY WAY

ROSEVILLE CA 95678-6420

Email: scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com

Status: INFORMATION

ANN L. TROWBRIDGE ATTORNEY

DOWNEY, BRAND, SEYMOUR & ROHWER, LLP

555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLR SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: Merced Irrigation District/Real Energy/South San

Joaquin Irrigation District

Email: atrowbridge@downeybrand.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JUNE M. SKILLMAN CONSULTANT

2010 GREENLEAF ST

SANTA ANA CA 92706

FOR: COMPLETE ENERGY SERVICES, INC.

Email: jskillman@prodigy.net Status: INFORMATION

JAMES D. SQUERI ATTORNEY

GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: California Retailers Association

Email: jsqueri@gmssr.com Status: APPEARANCE

Merideth Sterkel

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: mts@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

PAUL A. SZYMANSKI ATTORNEY

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

101 ASH ST

SAN DIEGO CA 92101

FOR: SDG&E

Email: pszymanski@sempra.com

Status: APPEARANCE

VICKI L. THOMPSON REGULATORY LAW DEPARTMENT

SEMPRA ENERGY

101 ASH ST, HQ-13 SAN DIEGO CA 92101 FOR: SEMPRA ENERGY Email: vthompson@sempra.com

Status: INFORMATION

NANCY TRONAAS

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 9TH ST. MS-20

SACRAMENTO CA 95814-5512 Email: ntronaas@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

MARY TUCKER SUPERVISING SPECIALIST

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

777 N. 1ST ST, STE 300 SAN JOSE CA 95112-6351

FOR: ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Email: mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

TIM TUTT

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 9TH ST, MS-45 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: ttutt@energy.state.ca.us Status: STATE-SERVICE

ANDREW J. VAN HORN VAN HORN CONSULTING

12 LIND COURT ORINDA CA 94563

Email: andy.vanhorn@vhcenergy.com

Status: APPEARANCE

LEONARD VIEJO PRESIDENT **ASTRUM UTILITY SERVICES** 462 STEVENS AVE., STE 308 SOLANA BEACH CA 92075

Email: Iviejo@astrumutilities.com

Status: APPEARANCE

JOY A. WARREN ATTORNEY MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1231 11TH ST

MODESTO CA 95354

FOR: Modesto Irrigation District

Email: joyw@mid.org Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT B. WEISENMILLER MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1999 HARRISON ST, STE 1440 OAKLAND CA 94612-3517 Email: mrw@mrwassoc.com

Status: INFORMATION

EDWARD WHELESS

COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS OF L.A.

PO BOX 4998 WHITTIER CA 90607

Email: ewheless@lacsd.org

Status: APPEARANCE

KEVIN WOODRUFF

WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES, INC.

1100 K ST, STE 204 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: kdw@woodruff-expert-services.com

Status: INFORMATION

ANDREW ULMER

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

3310 EL CAMINO AVE, STE 120 SACRAMENTO CA 95821

FOR: California Department of Water Resources

Email: aulmer@water.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

Carlos A. Velasquez

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: los@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

Ourania M. Vlahos

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

LEGAL DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5037 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: omv@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

LULU WEINZIMER

CALIFORNIA ENERGY CIRCUIT

695 9TH AVE. NO.2

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118

Email: lisaweinzimer@sbcglobal.net

Status: INFORMATION

GREGGORY L. WHEATLAND ATTORNEY ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: HERCULES MUNICIPAL UTILITY/The City of

Cucamonga

Email: glw@eslawfirm.com Status: APPEARANCE

CHRIS WILLIAMSON

BREITBURN ENERGY COMPANY, LLC

515 S. FLOWER ST, STE 4800 LOS ANGELES CA 90071

FOR: BreitBurn Energy Company, LLC Email: cwilliamson@breitburn.com

Status: APPEARANCE

CYNTHIA WOOTEN

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.

1126 DELAWARE ST BERKELEY CA 94702

Email: cwootencohen@earthlink.net

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. R0201011

Total number of addressees: 214

E. J.. WRIGHT OCCIDENTIAL ENERGY MARKETING, INC.

111 W. OCEAN BLVD. LONG BEACH CA 90802 Email: ej_wright@oxy.com Status: INFORMATION

Amy C. Yip-Kikugawa
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5135
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: ayk@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE Helen W. Yee

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

LEGAL DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5034 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: yee@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

ERIC YUSSMAN REGULATORY ANALYST FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES 9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE LOUISVILLE KY 40223

Email: eyussman@knowledgeinenergy.com

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006 Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; ALJ Assigned: Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding the Implementation of the Suspension of Direct Access Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1X and Decision 01-09-060.

Rulemaking 02-01-011 (Filed January 9, 2002)

Cem@newsdata.com;cpuccases@pge.com;case.admin@sce.com;mpa@a-

klaw.com;jarmstrong@gmssr.com;paj@cpuc.ca.gov;kdw@cpuc.ca.gov;michael.backstrom@sce.com;jguzman@nossaman.com;brbarkovich@earthlink.net;tomb@crossborderenergy.com;sberlin@mccarthylaw.com;blaising@braunlegal.com;wblattner@sempra.com;jbloom@whitecase.com;cjb@cpuc.ca.gov;wbooth@booth-

law.com;jbradley@svlg.net;jab@cpuc.ca.gov;abb@eslawfirm.com;abb@eslawfirm.com;mbrubaker@cons ultbai.com;jim@prudens.com;butzjh@apci.com;dbyers@landuselaw.com.;agc@cpuc.ca.gov;dcarroll@do wneybrand.com;scasey@sfwater.org;andrew.cheung@lausd.net;janet.combs@sce.com;joe.como@sfgov.org;cconklin@ussposco.com;jms@cpuc.ca.gov;tcorr@sempraglobal.com;lcottle@winston.com;kpc@cpuc.ca.gov;bcragg@gmssr.com;tcrooks@navigantconsulting.com;crcq@pge.com;roger.curtis@FDS.com;jdalessi@navigantconsulting.com;Andrew.dalton@valero.com;ctd@cpuc.ca.gov;mdaponde@pillsburywinthrop.com;khojasteh.davoodi@navy.mil;mday@gmssr.com;rmd@cpuc.ca.gov;ldecarlo@energy.state.ca.us;bdelamer@capstonturbine.com;ralph.dennis@constellation.com;psd@cpuc.ca.gov;douglass@energyattorney.com;gerspamer@mofo.com;rfp@eesconsulting.com;SFarkas@ppcla.com;centralfiles@semprautilities.com;bfinkelstein@turn.org;jf2@cpuc.ca.gov;mflorio@turn.org;freedman@turn.org;norman.furuta@navy.mil;dmg@cpuc.ca.gov;dgeis@dolphingroup.org;jgeorge@water.ca.gov;bobgex@dwt.com;yxg4@pge.com;rfg2@pge.com;hgolub@nixonpeabody.com;mgomez1@bart.gov;jeff.e.gray@lowes.com;stevegreenwald@dwt.com;kgriffin@energy.state.ca.us;jguzman@nossaman.com;dmhq@pge.com;phanschen@mofo.com;george.hanson@ci.corona.ca.us;pgh@cpuc.ca.gov;lmh@eslawfirm.com;lmh@eslawfirm.com;heiertz@irwd.com;christine-

henning@alliancepower.com;energyhig@aol.com;chrishilen@dwt.com;sdhilton@stoel.com;mhindus@pill sburywinthrop.com;rocky.ho@fticonsulting.com;rhoffman@anaheim.net;pvh1@pge.com;mxh@cpuc.ca.g ov;lwhouse@innercite.com;dhuard@manatt.com;mrh2@pge.com;ehull@ci.chula-

vista.ca.us;lmi@cpuc.ca.gov;mjaske@energy.state.ca.us;mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com;bill.julian@sen.ca.gov;ek@a-

klaw.com;kjk@kjkammerer.com;jkaspar@stockport.com;pucservice@manatt.com;cmkehrein@ems-ca.com;wkeilani@semprautilities.com;bsl@cpuc.ca.gov;kidow@saccounty.net;angela.kim@fticonsulting.com;ahk4@pge.com;chris@emeter.com;gig@cpuc.ca.gov;klatt@energyattorney.com;jkoontz@calwaterlaw.com;llk@cpuc.ca.gov;dlf@cpuc.ca.gov;JerryL@abag.ca.gov;dyl1@pge.com;jleslie@luce.com;liddell@energyattorney.com;rliebert@cfbf.com;karen@klindh.com;lawrence.lingbloom@sen.ca.gov;bjl@bry.com;lund@commerceenergy.com;bill@jbsenergy.com;mmattes@nossaman.com;chrism@mid.org;rmccann@umich.edu;bmcc@mccarthylaw.com;keith.mccrea@sablaw.com;jmckinney@thelenreid.com;blaising@braunlegal.com;JMcMahon@navigantconsulting.com;megmeal@aol.com;gmeyer@pmcos.com;kmills@cfbf.com;wmogel@saul.com;mike.montoya@sce.com;irene@igc.org;tmorgan@electric.com;kmorton@sempra.com;jpmosher@aeraenergy.com;rmrlik@intertie.com;jwmueller@attglobal.net;maric.munn@ucop.edu;ssmyers@att.net;rita@ritanortonconsulting.com;edwardoneill@dwt.com;pxo2@pge.com;jpacheco@water.ca.gov;mpatel@sidley.com;clpearce@duanemorris.com;npedersen@hanmor.com;apeters@semprautilities.com;lpeters@pacifier.com;sara@oakcreekenergy.com;epoole@adplaw.com;trp@cpuc.ca.gov;cpucrulings@navigantconsulting.com;cread@omm.com;rredlinger@chevrontexaco.com;jzr@cpuc.ca.gov;stuart@robertson-

bryan.com;rochmanm@spurr.org;hal@rwitz.net;scr@cpuc.ca.gov;jrosenbaum@whitecase.com;jimross@r-c-s-

inc.com;rroth@smud.org;running@eesconsulting.com;srusch@plainsxp.com;rlr2@pge.com;editorial@cal

Downloaded September 5, 2006, last updated on August 30, 2006

Commissioner Assigned: Geoffrey F. Brown on December 27, 2004; **ALJ Assigned:** Thomas R. Pulsifer on May 1, 2002

CPUC DOCKET NO. «aaDocketNo»

Total number of addressees: «TotalAddrCt»

iforniaenergycircuit.net;billscharfenberg@paulhastings.com;sschleimer@calpine.com;rschmidt@bartlewells.com;ds1957@camail.sbc.com;mshames@ucan.org;kms@cpuc.ca.gov;nes@a-klaw.com;Jennifer.Shigekawa@sce.com;kisimonsen@ems-

ca.com;jskillman@prodigy.net;filings@hotmail.com;jsqueri@gmssr.com;josephs@pplant.ucdavis.edu;mts @cpuc.ca.gov;jpoole@realenergy.com;pszymanski@sempra.com;pthompson@summitblue.com;vthomp son@sempra.com;scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com;ntronaas@energy.state.ca.us;atrowbridge@downeybra nd.com;mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov;ttutt@energy.state.ca.us;aulmer@water.ca.gov;andy.vanhorn@vhc energy.com;los@cpuc.ca.gov;lviejo@astrumutilities.com;omv@cpuc.ca.gov;joyw@mid.org;lisaweinzimer @sbcglobal.net;mrw@mrwassoc.com;glw@eslawfirm.com;ewheless@lacsd.org;cwilliamson@breitburn.c om;kdw@woodruff-expert-

services.com;cwootencohen@earthlink.net;ej_wright@oxy.com;yee@cpuc.ca.gov;ayk@cpuc.ca.gov;eyussman@knowledgeinenergy.com